UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

| United States of America, | | | Case No. CR 12-867 LB |
|---|-------|--|--|
| | | Plaintiff,) v.) | STIPULATED ORDER EXCLUDING TIME UNDER THE SPEEDY TRIAL ACT |
| Rex | W | Maid Botaith) Defendant. | NORTLERICARD 15 2013 |
| For the reasons stated by the parties on the record on 5, 2013, the Court excludes ringe under the speedy Trial Act from 5, 2013 to 5, 2013 and finds that the ends of justice served by the continuance outweigh the best interest of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(A). The Court makes this finding and bases this continuance on the following factor(s): | | | |
| _ | | Failure to grant a continuance would be lik See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(i). | ely to result in a miscarriage of justice. |
| ,- | | defendants, the nature of the prosecu or law, that it is unreasonable to expect ade | to [check applicable reasons] the number of ation, or the existence of novel questions of fact equate preparation for pretrial proceedings or the trial this section. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(ii). |
| - | | Failure to grant a continuance would deny taking into account the exercise of due dilig | the defendant reasonable time to obtain counsel, gence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv). |
| _ | | Failure to grant a continuance would unreasonably deny the defendant continuity of counsel, g counsel's other scheduled case commitments, taking into account the exercise of due diligence See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv). | |
| - | X | Failure to grant a continuance would unrea necessary for effective preparation, taking is See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv). | sonably deny the defendant the reasonable time into account the exercise of due diligence. |
| IT IS SO ORDERED. | | | |
| DATED: My 15, 2013 | | D: My 15 2013 | LAUREL BEELER United States Magistrate Judge |
| S | STIPU | JLATED: Attorney for Defendant | Assistant United States Attorney |